



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/754,804	01/08/2004	Montgomery C. McGraw	200600385-1	1592
22879 7590 09/11/2009 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration 3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528			EXAMINER EDWARDS, ANTHONY Q	
			ART UNIT 2835	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/11/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
jessica.l.fusek@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/754,804	Applicant(s) MCGRAW ET AL.	
	Examiner ANTHONY Q. EDWARDS	Art Unit 2835	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on May 26, 2009, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. The non-final Office Action is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.

/Jayprakash N Gandhi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2835

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 14-19, 25-29-36, 40, 44-48, 54-61 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,741,474 to Hung et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2004/0199568 to Lund. Referring to claim 1, Hung discloses a system for displaying chassis component information (see Fig. 1, i.e., "Prior Art") comprising a chassis (i.e., rack), a plurality of server computers (81) each coupled to the chassis, each server computer (81) comprising a respective LCD display (812) positioned upon the server computer (81), the respective LCD (812) operable to display chassis component information. See col. 1, lines 10-23. Lund does not specifically teach each server computer in the system being a "blade" server computer.

However, it is common in the art of computer server system design to use plural server blades in a server computer system. For example, Lund discloses a system and method for network communication utilizing a multi-server platform with blade server computers (120). See Fig. 1 and the corresponding specification of Lund.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of computer server system design at the time the invention was made to utilize a blade type server computer, as disclosed in Lund, and to include an LCD display provided on each server, as disclosed by Hung. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. See *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ____, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). The use of blade servers in a multi-server platform would increase server density and

provide a more scalable system, since the size or thickness of the blades would provide an ultra-dense platform.

Referring to claims 2 and 17, Hung in view of Lund disclose the device as claimed, wherein the chassis component information comprises server blade information of the server blade upon which the respective LCD is positioned. See col. 1, lines 15-16 of Hung.

Referring to claims 3, 4, 6, 18, 19, 27, 60 and 61, Hung in view of Lund disclose the device as claimed. See col. 1, lines 10-23 of Hung and paragraph 0049 of Lund, respectively.

Referring to claim 5, Hung in view of Lund disclose the device as substantially claimed, except for the LCD being operable to display the information in color. It is well known in the art of LCD devices to utilize a variety of colors, thus it would have been obvious to further modify Hung to include colors in the display, since this would help to distinguish one error or status message from another.

Referring to claims 14 and 67, Hung in view of Lund disclose the device as substantially claimed, except for the LCD specifically comprising a viewing area of 14mm x 11 mm. It would have been obvious, however, to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the LCD display (812) of Hung to the claimed dimensions, in order to provide a relatively small display to fit the server blades of Lund.

Referring to claims 15 and 26, Hung in view of Lund disclose the device as claimed, including a system for displaying chassis component information, comprising a chassis (110), a plurality of server blades (120) stacked in and coupled to the chassis, a

Art Unit: 2835

housing (100) enclosing the chassis and the plurality of server blades, each of the plurality of server blades (120) comprising a LCD (812) operable to display chassis component information and network configuration information with respect to the server blade, respectively. See Fig. 1 of Hung and Fig. 1 of Lund.

Referring to claim 16, Hung in view of Lund disclose the device as claimed, wherein each of the plurality of server blades (120) comprises a chassis management blade (140) operable to manage switch fabric of the chassis. See paragraph 0033 of Lund.

Referring to claim 25, Hung in view of Lund disclose the device as claimed, wherein the chassis blade comprises a network interface card. See paragraphs 0033 and 0036 of Lund.

Referring to claims 28 and 57, Hung in view of Lund disclose the device as claimed, wherein the respective display device comprises at least one light emitting diode (LED). See Fig. 3 of Hung, which shows LED lights (not numbered), on the right side of the front panel (112).

Referring to claim 29, Hung in view of Lund disclose the device as claimed, wherein the display device comprises an LCD (812). See Fig. 1 of Hung.

Regarding claims 30-35, 43-48, 54-56 and 58, the method steps are necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Hung in view of Lund.

Referring to claim 59, as indicated in the rejection to claim 1 above, Hung in view of Lund disclose the device as claimed, including a system for displaying server blade information (see Fig. 1 of Jung), comprising a plurality of server blades (see Fig. 1 of

Lund) at least partially enclosed in box (110) build with each server blade (120) including a liquid crystal display (812) positioned upon the server blade, the LCD operable to display server blade information. See col. 1, lines 10-23 of Lund.

Claims 7, 12, 13, 24, 36, 53 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hung in view of Lund, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,901,557 to Martinez. Referring to claims 7, 36 and 62, Hung as modified discloses the device as substantially claimed, except for the chassis component information comprises at least one of temperature information and voltage information. Martinez discloses a headless server system having state/activity indication icons provided on an LCD, wherein chassis component information (including temperature, voltage and fan operation information) is provided via the state/activity indication icons. See col. 4, line 64 through col. 5, line 5.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of computer server system design at the time the invention was made to further modify the device of Hung so that the LCD on each server blade provides state/activity of the chassis component information, including information relating to temperature, voltage and fan operation, respectively, as taught by Martinez, since the device of Martinez would provide easy to recognize icons to readily provide state/activity of the chassis component.

Referring to claims 12, 24, 41, 53 and 66, Hung as modified in view of Martinez disclose the device as claimed, wherein each server blade further comprises a respective management processor (123) operable to drive the respective LCD, the

management processor being operationally distinct from a main processor of the server blade such that the main processor may be inactive during operation of the respective LCD. See Fig. 1 of Martinez.

Referring to claims 13 and 42, Hung as modified in view of Martinez disclose the device as claimed, wherein each server blade further comprises a respective video output operable to output the chassis component information to an external display (200) and a respective management processor (i.e., on network 250) operable to drive the respective video output (200), the respective management processor operationally distinct from a respective main processor (102) of the server blade such that the respective main processor may be inactive during output of the chassis component information to the external display. See Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 50-55 of Martinez.

Claims 8-11, 20-23, 37-40, 49-52 and 63-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hung in view of Lund, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0084994 to Hansen. Referring to claims, 8-11, 20-22, 37-40, 49-51 and 63-65, Hung, as modified, discloses the system and corresponding method as claimed, including at least one server blade (140) including chassis management operable to manage switch fabric of the chassis. See paragraph 0033 of Lund. Hung, as modified, does not teach each server blade further comprising at least one control key associated with the LCD to enable operation control of at least one chassis component.

Hansen teaches a front panel serial port user interface (28) in the form of an LCD with control keys (40) to control setup and power on an individual server blade (10).

Art Unit: 2835

See Figs. 1-3 and paragraph 0021. It would have been obvious to further modify the system and method of Hung to include control key(s) for operational control of at least one chassis component on the server blade, as taught by Hansen, since the device of Hansen would allow for specific control functions on each server blade, in addition to status updates.

Referring to claims 23 and 52, Hung as modified in view of Hanson disclose the device as claimed, wherein the at least one chassis component comprises at least one chassis cooling fan. See paragraph 0020 of Hansen.

Claims 68-71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hung in view of Lund, in view of Martinez, and further in view of Hanson. Referring to claims 68-71, see the above rejection to claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 8 above. It would have been obvious to further modify the device of Hung to include the as claimed elements, since as indicated in the above rejections, the elements are combinable and the applicant has not disclosed that the combination solves any stated problem beyond what is disclosed in the prior art of record.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY Q. EDWARDS whose telephone number is (571)272-2042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:00).

Art Unit: 2835

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jayprakash N. Gandhi can be reached on 571-272-3740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. Q. E./

Examiner, Art Unit 2835

/Jayprakash N Gandhi/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2835

September 5, 2009

Application/Control Number: 10/754,804
Art Unit: 2835

Page 10